

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By the present Amendment, Claims 6, 7, 9 and 19 are amended. In addition, the title is amended as requested in the Office Action, and the specification is amended to address the objection to the drawings.

The objections to Claims 6 and 7 and the §112 rejection of Claim 19 are believed to be overcome by the amendments to the respective claims.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The Office Action asserted that in comparing Fig. 10 vs. Claim 1, there is a lack of a showing of interconnection or operative manner in which functions claimed are performed (referring to the specification at page 9, line to page 10, line 3). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As seen in Fig. 10, there is shown a digital TV 40 (example of the claimed electronic device) that includes a monitor 42 (example of a data processing subunit). Monitor 42 includes a video processing section 42A which effects signal processing such as adjustment of brightness and chromaticity on input video data. Monitor 42 further includes a display 42B, which is an example of a functional block operating as a terminating device. Display 42B “terminates” or “consumes” input video data by transforming the data to an image signal (typically with a D/A converter) and displaying the corresponding images on a display screen. Display 42B may also include processing circuitry for further processing the data supplied thereto prior to converting the same to an analog signal. DTV 40 also includes a memory 43 (example of the memory of Claim 1). Information pertaining to the subunit(s) such as monitor 42, existing within DTV 40, are stored in memory 43. In the illustrative embodiment, information pertaining to display 42B serving as the

terminating device, as well as information pertaining to video processing section 42A, is stored in the descriptor having monitor 42 information stored in memory 43.

Accordingly, from the foregoing explanation, it is readily apparent that the device as recited in Claim 1 has ample support in the specification, to enable one skilled in the art to reproduce and practice the invention without undue experimentation. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 and 19-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by the ITO publication. Claim 18 was rejected under §103 over the combination of ITO and the Ludtke patent. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons:

Considering Claim 1, the Office Action asserted that ITO discloses an electronic device for processing data that includes a data processing subunit (citing sections 0086 to 0088 of ITO); a functional block (citing sections 0104 and 0116 and Fig. 18, item 202); and a memory for storing information pertaining to the functional block (citing sections 0093 and 0182). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It is submitted that the above-cited passages of ITO do not disclose a functional block, included within a data processing subunit of an electronic device, operative as a termination device to terminate the data processed by the data processing subunit. Sections 0086 – 0088 of ITO discuss a conventional 1394 interface having a layer structure. The Examiner has not pointed out which element described in that passage is equivalent to the claimed electronic device, or to the claimed subunit. Indeed, those passages refer to Fig. 4, which shows an application layer 407, a serial bus management block 406, a transaction layer 405, a link layer 404, a physical layer 403 and a 1394 connector port 402, none of which are equivalent to the

claimed electronic device including the claimed subunit (with functional block) and the claimed memory.

On the other hand, the Office Action cites Fig. 18, item 202 for being equivalent to the claimed functional block. Item 202 is a stand-alone printer, which is not shown or disclosed to be included within any data processing subunit. Nor is the printer 202 disclosed to be part of any larger electronic device. Further, Fig. 18 is not shown to be a part of any of the components in Fig. 2, which the Examiner cited for disclosing the claimed electronic device. Accordingly, it should be readily apparent that the §102 rejection is misguided.

Accordingly, in light of the above differences, ITO does not include several essential elements of Applicant's invention of Claim 1, and thus cannot anticipate Claim 1 under §102. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102 rejection is respectfully solicited.

Independent Claims 19, 26 and 32 are patentable over ITO for at least the same reasons just discussed concerning analogous features of Claim 1.

The remaining claims in this application are patentable over ITO based at least upon their respective dependencies from one of the above-noted independent claims.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this Amendment, and the allowance of this application with Claims 1-33, are respectfully solicited.


The above statements concerning the disclosures in the cited references represent the present opinion of Applicants' representative and, in the event that the Examiner disagrees, Applicants' representative respectfully requests the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

It is submitted that the claims in this application, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made for clarification and to round out the scope of protection for the invention.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



Glenn F. Savit
Reg. No. 37,437
(212) 588-0800